arXiv:1407.3968v3 [math.ST] 11 May 2016

On Asymptotics Related to Classical Inference in Stochastic Differential Equations with Random Effects

Trisha Maitra and Sourabh Bhattacharya*

Abstract

Delattre *et al.* (2013) considered n independent stochastic differential equations (SDE's), where in each case the drift term is associated with a random effect, the distribution of which depends upon unknown parameters. Assuming the independent and identical (iid) situation the authors provide independent proofs of weak consistency and asymptotic normality of the maximum likelihood estimators (MLE's) of the hyper-parameters of their random effects parameters.

In this article, as an alternative route to proving consistency and asymptotic normality in the SDE set-up involving random effects, we verify the regularity conditions required by existing relevant theorems. In particular, this approach allowed us to prove strong consistency under weaker assumption. But much more importantly, we further consider the independent, but non-identical set-up associated with the random effects based SDE framework, and prove asymptotic results associated with the MLE's.

Keywords: *Asymptotic normality; Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality; Itô isometry; Maximum likelihood estimator; Random effects; Stochastic differential equations.*

1 Introduction

Delattre *et al.* (2013) study mixed-effects stochastic differential equations (SDE's) of the following form:

$$dX_i(t) = b(X_i(t), \phi_i)dt + \sigma(X_i(t))dW_i(t), \quad \text{with} \quad X_i(0) = x^i,\ i = 1, \ldots, n. \tag{1.1}$$

Here, for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, the stochastic process $X_i(t)$ is assumed to be continuously observed on the time interval $[0, T_i]$ with $T_i > 0$ known, and $\{x^i;\ i = 1, \ldots, n\}$ are the known initial values of the i-th process. The processes $\{W_i(\cdot);\ i = 1, \ldots, n\}$ are independent standard Brownian motions, and $\{\phi_i;\ i = 1, \ldots, n\}$ are independently and identically distributed (iid) random variables with common distribution $g(\varphi, \theta)d\nu(\varphi)$ (for all θ, $g(\varphi, \theta)$ is a density with respect to a dominating measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$, where $\mathbb{R}$ is the real line and d is the dimension), which are independent of the Brownian motions. Here $\theta \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ ($p \geq 2d$) is an unknown parameter to be estimated. The functions $b : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ and $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ are the drift function and the diffusion coefficient, respectively, both assumed to be known. Delattre *et al.* (2013) impose regularity conditions that ensure existence of solutions of (1.1). We adopt their assumptions, which are as follows.

(H1) (i) The function $(x, \varphi) \mapsto b(x, \varphi)$ is C^1 (differentiable with continuous first derivative) on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, and such that there exists $K > 0$ so that

$$b^2(x, \varphi) \leq K(1 + x^2 + |\varphi|^2),$$

for all $(x, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$.

(ii) The function $\sigma(\cdot)$ is C^1 on $\mathbb{R}$ and

$$\sigma^2(x) \leq K(1 + x^2),$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

(H2) Let X_i^φ be associated with the SDE of the form (1.1) with drift function $b(x, \varphi)$. Also letting $Q_\varphi^{x^i, T_i}$ denote the joint distribution of $\{X_i^\varphi(t);\ t \in [0, T_i]\}$, it is assumed that for $i = 1, \ldots, n$,

*Trisha Maitra is a PhD student and Sourabh Bhattacharya is an Associate Professor in Interdisciplinary Statistical Research Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, 203, B. T. Road, Kolkata 700108. Corresponding e-mail: sourabh@isical.ac.in.

and for all φ, φ', the following holds:

$$Q_{\varphi}^{x^i,T_i}\left(\int_0^{T_i}\frac{b^2\left(X_i^{\varphi}(t),\varphi'\right)}{\sigma^2(X_i^{\varphi}(t))}dt<\infty\right)=1.$$

(H3) For $f=\frac{\partial b}{\partial \varphi_j},\ j=1,\ldots,d$, there exist $c>0$ and some $\gamma\geq 0$ such that

$$\sup_{\varphi\in\mathbb{R}^d}\frac{|f(x,\varphi)|}{\sigma^2(x)}\leq c\left(1+|x|^{\gamma}\right).$$

Statistically, the i-th process $X_i(\cdot)$ can be thought of as modelling the i-th individual and the corresponding random variable ϕ_i denotes the random effect of individual i. For statistical inference, we follow Delattre *et al.* (2013) who consider the special case where $b(x,\phi_i)=\phi_i b(x)$. We assume

(H1′) (i) $b(\cdot)$ and $\sigma(x)$ are C^1 on $\mathbb{R}$ satisfying $b^2(x)\leq K(1+x^2)$ and $\sigma^2(x)\leq K(1+x^2)$ for all $x\in\mathbb{R}$, for some $K>0$.

(ii) Almost surely for each $i\geq 1$,

$$\int_0^{T_i}\frac{b^2(X_i(s))}{\sigma^2(X_i(s))}ds<\infty.$$

Under this assumption, (H3) is no longer required; see Delattre *et al.* (2013). Moreover, Proposition 1 of Delattre *et al.* (2013) holds; in particular, if for $k\geq 1$, $E|\phi_i|^{2k}<\infty$, then for all $T>0$,

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]}E\left[X_i(t)\right]^{2k}<\infty. \tag{1.2}$$

As in Delattre *et al.* (2013) we assume that ϕ_i are normally distributed. Hence, (1.2) is satisfied in our case. Delattre *et al.* (2013) show that the likelihood, depending upon θ, admits a relatively simple form composed of the following sufficient statistics:

$$U_i=\int_0^{T_i}\frac{b(X_i(s))}{\sigma^2(X_i(s))}dX_i(s),\quad V_i=\int_0^{T_i}\frac{b^2(X_i(s))}{\sigma^2(X_i(s))}ds,\quad i=1,\ldots,n. \tag{1.3}$$

The exact likelihood is given by

$$L(\theta)=\prod_{i=1}^{n}\lambda_i(X_i,\theta), \tag{1.4}$$

where

$$\lambda_i(X_i,\theta)=\int_{\mathbb{R}}g(\varphi,\theta)\exp\left(\varphi U_i-\frac{\varphi^2}{2}V_i\right)d\nu(\varphi). \tag{1.5}$$

Assuming that $g(\varphi,\theta)d\nu(\varphi)\equiv N\left(\mu,\omega^2\right)$, Delattre *et al.* (2013) obtain the following form of $\lambda_i(X_i,\theta)$:

$$\lambda_i(X_i,\theta)=\frac{1}{\left(1+\omega^2V_i\right)^{1/2}}\exp\left[-\frac{V_i}{2\left(1+\omega^2V_i\right)}\left(\mu-\frac{U_i}{V_i}\right)^2\right]\exp\left(\frac{U_i^2}{2V_i}\right), \tag{1.6}$$

where $\theta=(\mu,\omega^2)\in\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^+$. As in Delattre *et al.* (2013), here we assume that

(H2′) Ω is compact.

Delattre *et al.* (2013) consider $x^i=x$ and $T_i=T$ for $i=1,\ldots,n$, so that the set-up boils down to the iid situation, and investigate asymptotic properties of the MLE of θ, providing proofs of consistency and asymptotic normality independently, without invoking the general results already existing

in the literature. In this article, as an alternative, we prove asymptotic properties of the MLE in this SDE set-up by verifying the regularity conditions of relevant theorems already existing in the literature. Our approach allowed us to prove strong consistency of MLE, rather than weak consistency proved by Delattre *et al.* (2013). Also, importantly, our approach does not require assumption (H4) of Delattre *et al.* (2013) which required (U_1, V_1) to have density with respect to the Lebsegue measure on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^+$, which must be jointly continuous and positive on an open ball of $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^+$).

Far more importantly, we consider the independent but non-identical case (we refer to the latter as non-iid), and prove consistency and asymptotic normality of the MLE in this set-up. In what follows, in Section 2 we investigate asymptotic properties of MLE in the iid context. In Section 3 we investigate classical asymptotics in the non-iid set-up. We summarize our work and provide concluding remarks in Section 4.

Notationally, "$\xrightarrow{a.s.}$", "$\xrightarrow{P}$" and "$\xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}}$" denote convergence "almost surely", "in probability" and "in distribution", respectively.

2 Consistency and asymptotic normality of MLE in the iid set-up

2.1 Strong consistency of MLE

Consistency of the MLE under the iid set-up can be verified by validating the regularity conditions of the following theorem (Theorems 7.49 and 7.54 of Schervish (1995)); for our purpose we present the version for compact Ω.

Theorem 1 (Schervish (1995)) *Let $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be conditionally iid given θ with density $f_1(x|\theta)$ with respect to a measure ν on a space $\left(\mathcal{X}^1, \mathcal{B}^1\right)$. Fix $\theta_0 \in \Omega$, and define, for each $M \subseteq \Omega$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}^1$,*

$$Z(M, x) = \inf_{\psi \in M} \log \frac{f_1(x|\theta_0)}{f_1(x|\psi)}.$$

Assume that for each $\theta \neq \theta_0$, there is an open set N_θ such that $\theta \in N_\theta$ and that $E_{\theta_0} Z(N_\theta, X_i) > -\infty$. Also assume that $f_1(x|\cdot)$ is continuous at θ for every θ, a.s. $[P_{\theta_0}]$. Then, if $\hat{\theta}_n$ is the MLE of θ corresponding to n observations, it holds that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \hat{\theta}_n = \theta_0$, a.s. $[P_{\theta_0}]$.

2.1.1 Verification of strong consistency of MLE in our SDE set-up

To verify the conditions of Theorem 1 in our case, we note that for any x, $f_1(x|\theta) = \lambda_1(x, \theta) = \lambda(x, \theta)$ given by (1.6), which is clearly continuous in θ. Also, it follows from the proof of Proposition 7 of Delattre *et al.* (2013) that for every $\theta \neq \theta_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\log \frac{f_1(x|\theta_0)}{f_1(x|\theta)} &= \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{1 + \omega^2 V_1}{1 + \omega_0^2 V_1} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{(\omega_0^2 - \omega^2) U_1^2}{(1 + \omega^2 V_1)(1 + \omega_0^2 V_1)} \\
&\quad + \frac{\mu^2 V_1}{2(1 + \omega^2 V_1)} - \frac{\mu U_1}{1 + \omega^2 V_1} - \left(\frac{\mu_0^2 V_1}{2(1 + \omega_0^2 V_1)} - \frac{\mu_0 U_1}{1 + \omega_0^2 V_1} \right) \\
&\geq -\frac{1}{2} \left\{ \log \left(1 + \frac{\omega^2}{\omega_0^2} \right) + \frac{|\omega^2 - \omega_0^2|}{\omega^2} \right\} - \frac{1}{2} |\omega_0^2 - \omega^2| \left(\frac{U_1}{1 + \omega_0^2 V_1} \right)^2 \left(1 + \frac{\omega_0^2}{\omega^2} \right) \\
&\quad - |\mu| \left| \frac{U_1}{1 + \omega_0^2 V_1} \right| \left(1 + \frac{|\omega_0^2 - \omega^2|}{\omega^2} \right) - \left| \frac{\mu_0^2 V_1}{2(1 + \omega_0^2 V_1)} \right| - \left| \frac{\mu_0 U_1}{1 + \omega_0^2 V_1} \right|. \qquad (2.1)
\end{aligned}$$

Taking $N_\theta = \left(\underline{\mu}, \overline{\mu}\right) \times \left(\underline{\omega}^2, \overline{\omega}^2\right)$, and noting that $E_{\theta_0} \left(\frac{U_1}{1+\omega_0^2 V_1} \right)^2$, $E_{\theta_0} \left| \frac{U_1}{1+\omega_0^2 V_1} \right|$ and $E_{\theta_0} \left(\frac{\mu_0^2 V_1}{2(1+\omega_0^2 V_1)} \right)$ are finite due to Lemma 1 of Delattre *et al.* (2013), it follows that $E_{\theta_0} Z(N_\theta, X_i) > -\infty$. Hence, $\hat{\theta}_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} \theta_0$ $[P_{\theta_0}]$. We summarize the result in the form of the following theorem:

Theorem 2 *Assume the iid setup and conditions (H1′) and (H2′). Then the MLE is strongly consistent in the sense that $\hat{\theta}_n \overset{a.s.}{\to} \theta_0$ $[P_{\theta_0}]$.*

2.2 Asymptotic normality of MLE

To verify asymptotic normality of MLE we invoke the following theorem provided in Schervish (1995) (Theorem 7.63):

Theorem 3 (Schervish (1995)) *Let Ω be a subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$, and let $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be conditionally iid given θ each with density $f_1(\cdot|\theta)$. Let $\hat{\theta}_n$ be an MLE. Assume that $\hat{\theta}_n \overset{P}{\to} \theta$ under P_θ for all θ. Assume that $f_1(x|\theta)$ has continuous second partial derivatives with respect to θ and that differentiation can be passed under the integral sign. Assume that there exists $H_r(x,\theta)$ such that, for each $\theta_0 \in int(\Omega)$ and each k, j,*

$$\sup_{\|\theta-\theta_0\|\le r} \left| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_k\partial\theta_j} \log f_{X_1|\Theta}(x|\theta_0) - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_k\partial\theta_j} \log f_{X_1|\Theta}(x|\theta) \right| \le H_r(x,\theta_0), \tag{2.2}$$

with

$$\lim_{r\to 0} E_{\theta_0} H_r\left(X,\theta_0\right) = 0. \tag{2.3}$$

Assume that the Fisher information matrix $\mathcal{I}(\theta)$ is finite and non-singular. Then, under P_{θ_0},

$$\sqrt{n}\left(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0\right) \overset{\mathcal{L}}{\to} N\left(\mathbf{0}, \mathcal{I}^{-1}(\theta_0)\right). \tag{2.4}$$

2.2.1 Verification of the above regularity conditions for asymptotic normality in our SDE set-up

In Section 2.1.1 we proved almost sure consistency of the MLE $\hat{\theta}_n$ in the SDE set-up. Hence, $\hat{\theta}_n \overset{P}{\to} \theta$ under P_θ for all θ. In the proof of Proposition 5, Delattre *et al.* (2013) show that differentiation can be passed under the integral sign. Letting $\gamma_i(\theta) = \frac{U_i - \mu V_i}{1+\omega^2 V_i}$ and $I_i = \frac{V_i}{1+\omega^2 V_i}$, note that (see the proof of Proposition 6 of Delattre *et al.* (2013))

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\mu^2} \log f_1(x|\theta) = -I_1(\omega^2), \quad \frac{\partial^2}{\partial\mu\partial\omega^2} \log f_1(x|\theta) = -\gamma_1(\theta) I_1(\omega^2); \tag{2.5}$$

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\omega^2\partial\omega^2} \log f_1(x|\theta) = -\frac{1}{2}\left(2\gamma_1^2(\theta) I_1(\omega^2) - I_1^2(\omega^2)\right). \tag{2.6}$$

It follows from (2.5) and (2.6) that in our case $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_k\partial\theta_j} \log f_1(x|\theta)$ is differentiable in $\theta = (\mu, \omega^2)$, and the derivative has finite expectation; see the proof of Proposition 8 of Delattre *et al.* (2013)). Hence, (2.2) and (2.3) clearly hold. Following Delattre *et al.* (2013) we assume:

(H3′) The true value $\theta_0 \in int\left(\Omega\right)$.

That the information matrix $\mathcal{I}(\theta)$ is finite and is the covariance matrix of the vector $\left(\gamma_1(\theta), \frac{1}{2}\left(\gamma_1^2(\theta) - I_1\left(\omega^2\right)\right)\right)$ (hence, nonnegative-definite), are shown in Delattre *et al.* (2013). We additionally assume, as Delattre *et al.* (2013):

(H4′) The information matrix $\mathcal{I}(\theta_0)$ is invertible.

Hence, asymptotic normality of the MLE, of the form (2.4), holds in our case. Formally,

Theorem 4 *Assume the iid setup and conditions (H1′) – (H4′). Then the MLE is asymptotically normally distributed as (2.4).*

3 Consistency and asymptotic normality of MLE in the non-iid set-up

We now consider the case where the processes $X_i(\cdot);\ i = 1, \ldots, n$, are independently, but not identically distributed. This happens when we no longer enforce the restrictions $T_i = T$ and $x^i = x$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. However, we do assume that the sequences $\{T_1, T_2, \ldots\}$ and $\{x^1, x^2, \ldots, \}$ are sequences entirely contained in compact sets $\mathfrak{T}$ and $\mathfrak{X}$, respectively. Due to compactness, there exist convergent subsequences with limits in $\mathfrak{T}$ and $\mathfrak{X}$. Abusing notation, we continue to denote the convergent subsequences as $\{T_1, T_2, \ldots\}$ and $\{x^1, x^2, \ldots\}$. Let the limts be $T^\infty \in \mathfrak{T}$ and $x^\infty \in \mathfrak{X}$.

Now, since the distributions of the processes $X_i(\cdot)$ are uniquely defined on the space of real, continuous functions $\mathcal{C}\left([0, T_i] \mapsto \mathbb{R}\right) = \{f : [0, T_i] \mapsto \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } f \text{ is continuous}\}$, given any $t \in [0, T_i]$, $f(t)$ is clearly a continuous function of the initial value $f(0) = x$. To emphasize dependence on x, we denote the function as $f(t, x)$. In fact, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta_\epsilon > 0$ such that whenever $|x_1 - x_2| < \delta_\epsilon$, $|f(t, x_1) - f(t, x_2)| < \epsilon$ for all $t \in [0, T_i]$.

Henceforth, we denote the process associated with the initial value x and time point t as $X(t, x)$, and by $\phi(x)$ the random effect parameter associated with the initial value x such that $\phi(x^i) = \phi_i$. We assume that

(H5′) $\phi(x)$ is a real-valued, continuous function of x, and that for $k \geq 1$,

$$\sup_{x \in \mathfrak{X}} E\left[\phi(x)\right]^{2k} < \infty. \tag{3.1}$$

For $x \in \mathfrak{X}$ and $T \in \mathfrak{T}$, let

$$U(x, T) = \int_0^T \frac{b(X(s, x))}{\sigma^2(X(s, x))} dX(s, x); \tag{3.2}$$

$$V(x, T) = \int_0^T \frac{b^2(X(s, x))}{\sigma^2(X(s, x))} ds. \tag{3.3}$$

Clearly, $U(x^i, T_i) = U_i$ and $V(x^i, T_i) = V_i$, where U_i and V_i are given by (1.3). In this non-iid set-up we assume that

(H6′)

$$\frac{b^2(x)}{\sigma^2(x)} < K(1 + x^\tau), \text{ for some } \tau \geq 1. \tag{3.4}$$

This assumption ensures that moments of all orders of $V(x, T)$ are finite. Then the moments of uniformly integrable continuous functions of $U(x, T)$, $V(x, T)$ and θ are continuous in x, T and θ. The result is formalized as Theorem 5, the proof of which is presented in the Appendix.

Theorem 5 *Assume (H5′) and (H6′). Let $h(u, v, \theta)$ be any continuous function of u, v and θ, such that for any sequences $\{x_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$, $\{T_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ and $\{\theta_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$, converging to $\tilde{x}$, $\tilde{T}$ and $\tilde{\theta}$, respectively, for any $\tilde{x} \in \mathfrak{X}$, $\tilde{T} \in \mathfrak{T}$ and $\tilde{\theta} \in \Omega$, the sequence $\{h\left(U(x_m, T_m), V(x_m, T_m), \theta_m\right)\}_{m=1}^\infty$ is uniformly integrable. Then, as $m \to \infty$,*

$$E\left[h\left(U(x_m, T_m), V(x_m, T_m), \theta_m\right)\right] \to E\left[h\left(U(\tilde{x}, \tilde{T}), V(\tilde{x}, \tilde{T}), \tilde{\theta}\right)\right]. \tag{3.5}$$

Corollary 6 *As in Delattre* et al. *(2013), consider the function*

$$h(u, v) = \exp\left(\psi \frac{u}{1 + \xi v}\right), \tag{3.6}$$

where $\psi \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Then, for any sequences $\{x_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ and $\{T_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ converging to $\tilde{x}$ and $\tilde{T}$,

for any $\tilde{x} \in \mathfrak{X}$ *and* $\tilde{T} \in \mathfrak{T}$*, and for* $k \geq 1$*,*

$$E\left[h\left(U(x_m, T_m), V(x_m, T_m)\right)\right]^k \to E\left[h\left(U(\tilde{x}, \tilde{T}), V(\tilde{x}, \tilde{T})\right)\right]^k, \tag{3.7}$$

as $m \to \infty$*.*

The proof of the above corollary only entails proving uniform integrability of $\{h\left(U(x_m, T_m), V(x_m, T_m)\right)\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$, which simply follows from the proof of Lemma 1 of Delattre *et al.* (2013).

Note that in our case, the Kullback-Leibler distance and Fisher's information are expectations of functions of the form $h(u, v, \theta)$, continuous in u, v and θ. Assumption (H6′), the upper bounds provided in Delattre *et al.* (2013), Corollary 6, and compactness of Ω, can be used to easily verify uniform integrability of the relevant sequences. It follows that in our situation the Kullback-Leibler distance, which we now denote by $\mathcal{K}_{x,T}(\theta_0, \theta)$ (or $\mathcal{K}_{x,T}(\theta, \theta_0)$) to emphasize dependence on x, T and θ are continuous in θ, x and T. Similarly, the elements of the Fisher's information matrix $\mathcal{I}_{x,T}(\theta)$ are continuous in θ, x and T. For $x = x^k$ and $T = T_k$, we denote the Kullback-Leibler distance and the Fisher's information as $\mathcal{K}_k(\theta_0, \theta)$ ($\mathcal{K}_k(\theta, \theta_0)$) and $\mathcal{I}_k(\theta)$, respectively.

Continuity of $\mathcal{K}_{x,T}(\theta_0, \theta)$ (or $\mathcal{K}_{x,T}(\theta, \theta_0)$) and $\mathcal{I}_{x,T}(\theta_0)$ with respect to x and T ensures that as $x^k \to x^\infty$ and $T_k \to T^\infty$, $\mathcal{K}_{x^k,T_k}(\theta_0, \theta) \to \mathcal{K}_{x^\infty,T^\infty}(\theta_0, \theta) = \mathcal{K}(\theta_0, \theta)$, say. Similarly, $\mathcal{K}_{x^k,T_k}(\theta, \theta_0) \to \mathcal{K}(\theta, \theta_0)$ and $\mathcal{I}_{x^k,T_k}(\theta) \to \mathcal{I}_{x^\infty,T^\infty}(\theta) = \mathcal{I}(\theta)$, say. Since X^∞ and T^∞ are contained in the respective compact sets, the limits $\mathcal{K}(\theta_0, \theta)$, $\mathcal{K}(\theta, \theta_0)$ and $\mathcal{I}(\theta)$ are well-defined Kullback-Leibler divergences and Fisher's information, respectively. From the above limits, it follow that for any $\theta \in \Omega$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n \mathcal{K}_k(\theta_0, \theta)}{n} = \mathcal{K}(\theta_0, \theta); \tag{3.8}$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n \mathcal{K}_k(\theta, \theta_0)}{n} = \mathcal{K}(\theta, \theta_0); \tag{3.9}$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n \mathcal{I}_k(\theta)}{n} = \mathcal{I}(\theta). \tag{3.10}$$

We investigate consistency and asymptotic normality of MLE in our case using the results of Hoadley (1971). The limit results (3.8), (3.9) and (3.10) will play important roles in our proceedings.

3.1 Consistency and asymptotic normality of MLE in the non-iid set-up

Following Hoadley (1971) we define the following:

$$\begin{aligned} R_i(\theta) &= \log \frac{f_i(X_i|\theta)}{f_i(X_i|\theta_0)} \quad \text{if } f_i(X_i|\theta_0) > 0 \\ &= 0 \qquad\qquad\qquad\quad \text{otherwise.} \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

$$R_i(\theta, \rho) = \sup\left\{R_i(\xi) : \|\xi - \theta\| \leq \rho\right\} \tag{3.12}$$

$$\mathcal{V}_i(r) = \sup\left\{R_i(\theta) : \|\theta\| > r\right\}. \tag{3.13}$$

Following Hoadley (1971) we denote by $r_i(\theta)$, $r_i(\theta, \rho)$ and $v_i(r)$ to be expectations of $R_i(\theta)$, $R_i(\theta, \rho)$ and $\mathcal{V}_i(r)$ under θ_0; for any sequence $\{a_i; i = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ we denote $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i/n$ by $\bar{a}_n$.

Hoadley (1971) proved that if the following regularity conditions are satisfied, then the MLE $\hat{\theta}_n \xrightarrow{P} \theta_0$:

(1) Ω is a closed subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$.

(2) $f_i(X_i|\theta)$ is an upper semicontinuous function of θ, uniformly in i, a.s. $[P_{\theta_0}]$.

(3) There exist $\rho^* = \rho^*(\theta) > 0$, $r > 0$ and $0 < K^* < \infty$ for which

(i) $E_{\theta_0}\left[R_i(\theta,\rho)\right]^2 \leq K^*, \quad 0 \leq \rho \leq \rho^*$;

(ii) $E_{\theta_0}\left[\mathcal{V}_i(r)\right]^2 \leq K^*$.

(4) (i) $\lim_{n\to\infty} \bar{r}_n(\theta) < 0, \quad \theta \neq \theta_0$;

(ii) $\lim_{n\to\infty} \bar{v}_n(r) < 0$.

(5) $R_i(\theta,\rho)$ and $\mathcal{V}_i(r)$ are measurable functions of X_i.

Actually, conditions (3) and (4) can be weakened but these are more easily applicable (see Hoadley (1971) for details).

3.1.1 Verification of the regularity conditions

Since Ω is compact in our case, the first regularity condition clearly holds.

For the second regularity condition, note that given X_i, $f_i(X_i|\theta)$ is continuous, in fact, uniformly continuous in θ in our case, since Ω is compact. Hence, for any given $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta_i(\epsilon) > 0$, independent of θ, such that $\|\theta_1 - \theta_2\| < \delta_i(\epsilon)$ implies $|f(X_i|\theta_1) - f(X_i|\theta_2)| < \epsilon$. Now consider a strictly positive function $\delta_{x,T}(\epsilon)$, continuous in $x \in \mathfrak{X}$ and $T \in \mathfrak{T}$, such that $\delta_{x^i,T_i}(\epsilon) = \delta_i(\epsilon)$. Let $\delta(\epsilon) = \inf_{x\in\mathfrak{X},T\in\mathfrak{T}} \delta_{x,T}(\epsilon)$. Since $\mathfrak{X}$ and $\mathfrak{T}$ are compact, it follows that $\delta(\epsilon) > 0$. Now it holds that $\|\theta_1 - \theta_2\| < \delta(\epsilon)$ implies $|f(X_i|\theta_1) - f(X_i|\theta_2)| < \epsilon$, for all i. Hence, the second regularity condition is satisfied.

Let us now focus attention on condition (3)(i). It follows from (2.1) that

$$R_i(\theta) \leq \frac{1}{2}\left\{\log\left(1+\frac{\omega^2}{\omega_0^2}\right) + \frac{|\omega^2-\omega_0^2|}{\omega^2}\right\} + \frac{1}{2}|\omega_0^2-\omega^2|\left(\frac{U_i}{1+\omega_0^2 V_i}\right)^2\left(1+\frac{\omega_0^2}{\omega^2}\right) + |\mu|\left|\frac{U_i}{1+\omega_0^2 V_i}\right|\left(1+\frac{|\omega_0^2-\omega^2|}{\omega^2}\right) + \left(\frac{\mu_0^2 V_i}{2(1+\omega_0^2 V_i)} - \frac{\mu_0 U_i}{1+\omega_0^2 V_i}\right). \tag{3.14}$$

Let us denote $\{\xi \in \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^+ : \|\xi-\theta\| \leq \rho\}$ by $S(\rho,\theta)$. Here $0 < \rho < \rho^*(\theta)$, and $\rho^*(\theta)$ is so small that $S(\rho,\theta) \subset \Omega$ for all $\rho \in (0,\rho^*(\theta))$. It then follows from (3.14) that

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{\xi\in S(\rho,\theta)} R_i(\xi) \leq & \sup_{(\mu,\omega^2)\in S(\rho,\theta)} \frac{1}{2}\left\{\log\left(1+\frac{\omega^2}{\omega_0^2}\right) + \frac{|\omega^2-\omega_0^2|}{\omega^2}\right\} \\ & + \left(\frac{U_i}{1+\omega_0^2 V_i}\right)^2 \times \sup_{(\mu,\omega^2)\in S(\rho,\theta)} \left[\frac{1}{2}|\omega_0^2-\omega^2|\left(1+\frac{\omega_0^2}{\omega^2}\right)\right] \\ & + \left|\frac{U_i}{1+\omega_0^2 V_i}\right| \times \sup_{(\mu,\omega^2)\in S(\rho,\theta)} \left[|\mu|\left(1+\frac{|\omega_0^2-\omega^2|}{\omega^2}\right)\right] \\ & + \left|\frac{\mu_0^2 V_i}{2(1+\omega_0^2 V_i)}\right| + \left|\frac{\mu_0 U_i}{1+\omega_0^2 V_i}\right|. \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

The supremums in (3.15) are finite due to compactness of $S(\rho,\theta)$. Since under P_{θ_0}, $U_i/(1+\omega_0^2 V_i)$ admits moments of all orders and $0 < I_i(\omega_0^2) = \frac{V_i}{1+\omega_0^2 V_i} < \frac{1}{\omega_0^2}$ (see Delattre *et al.* (2013)), it follows from (3.15) that

$$E_{\theta_0}\left[R_i(\theta,\rho)\right]^2 \leq K_i(\theta), \tag{3.16}$$

where $K_i(\theta) = K(x^i,T_i,\theta)$, with $K(x,T,\theta)$ being a continuous function of (x,T,θ), continuity being a consequence of Theorem 5. Since because of compactness of $\mathfrak{X}$, $\mathfrak{T}$ and Ω,

$$K_i(\theta) \leq \sup_{x\in\mathfrak{X},T\in\mathfrak{T},\theta\in\Omega} K(x,T,\theta) < \infty,$$

regularity condition (3)(i) follows.

To verify condition (3)(ii), first note that we can choose $r > 0$ such that $\|\theta_0\| < r$ and $\{\theta \in \Omega : \|\theta\| > r\} \neq \emptyset$. It then follows that $\sup_{\{\theta\in\Omega:\|\theta\|>r\}} R_i(\theta) \leq \sup_{\theta\in\Omega} R_i(\theta)$ for every $i \geq 1$. The right hand side is bounded by the same expression as the right hand side of (3.15), with only $S(\theta, \rho)$ replaced with Ω. The rest of the verification follows in the same way as verification of (3)(i).

To verify condition (4)(i) note that by (3.8)

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \bar{r}_n = -\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{K}_i(\theta_0, \theta)}{n} = -\mathcal{K}(\theta_0, \theta) < 0 \quad \text{for } \theta \neq \theta_0. \tag{3.17}$$

In other words, (4)(i) is satisfied.

To verify (4)(ii) we first show that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \bar{v}_n$ exists for suitably chosen $r > 0$. Then we prove that the limit is negative. To see that the limit exists, we first write $R_{x,T}(\theta) = -\mathcal{K}_{x,T}(\theta_0, \theta)$. Clearly, $R_i(\theta) = R_{x^i,T_i}(\theta)$. Using the arguments provided in the course of verification of (3)(ii), and the moment existence result of Delattre *et al.* (2013), yield

$$\sup_{i\geq 1} E_{\theta_0}\left[\sup_{\{\theta\in\Omega:\|\theta\|>r\}} R_i(\theta)\right]^2 \leq \sup_{i\geq 1} E_{\theta_0}\left[\sup_{\theta\in\Omega} R_i(\theta)\right]^2 \leq \sup_{x\in\mathfrak{X},T\in\mathfrak{T}} K_1(x,T), \tag{3.18}$$

where $K_1(x,T)$ is a continuous function of x and T. That $K_1(x,T)$ is continuous in x and T follows from Theorem 5; the required uniform integrability follows due to finiteness of the moments of the random variable $U(x,T)/\left\{1+\omega^2 V(x,T)\right\}$, for every $x \in \mathfrak{X}$ and $T \in \mathfrak{T}$, and compactness of $\mathfrak{X}$ and $\mathfrak{T}$. Now, because of compactness of $\mathfrak{X}$ and $\mathfrak{T}$ it also follows that the right hand side of (3.18) is finite, proving uniform integrability of $\left\{\sup_{\{\theta\in\Omega:\|\theta\|>r\}} R_i(\theta)\right\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$. Hence, it follows from Theorem 5 that $v_{x,T} = E_{\theta_0}\left[\sup_{\{\theta\in\Omega:\|\theta\|>r\}} R_{x,T}(\theta)\right]$ is continuous in x and T. Since $x^i \to x^\infty$ and $T_i \to T^\infty$,

$$\bar{v}_i = \bar{v}_{x^i,T_i} \to \bar{v}_{x^\infty,T^\infty}.$$

Since $\bar{v}_{x,T}$ is well-defined for every $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, $T \in \mathfrak{T}$, and since $x^\infty \in \mathfrak{X}$, $T^\infty \in \mathfrak{T}$, $\bar{v}_{x^\infty,T^\infty}$ is also well-defined. It follows that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \bar{v}_n = \bar{v}_{x^\infty,T^\infty}$$

exists.

To show that the limit $\lim_{n\to\infty} \bar{v}_n$ is negative, let us first re-write $\mathcal{V}_i(r)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{V}_i(r) &= -\inf_{\{\theta\in\Omega:\|\theta\|>r\}} \left[\log \frac{f_i(X_i|\theta_0)}{f_i(X_i|\theta)}\right] \\
&\leq -\inf_{\{\theta\in\Omega:\|\theta\|\geq r\}} \left[\log \frac{f_i(X_i|\theta_0)}{f_i(X_i|\theta)}\right] \\
&= -\log \frac{f_i(X_i|\theta_0)}{f_i(X_i|\theta_i^*(X_i))},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

for some $\theta_i^*(X_i)$, depending upon X_i, contained in $\Omega_r = \Omega \cap \{\theta : \|\theta\| \geq r\}$. Recall that we chose $r > 0$ such that $\|\theta_0\| < r$ and $\Omega \cap \{\theta : \|\theta\| > r\} \neq \emptyset$, so that $\theta_i^*(X_i) \neq \theta_0$ as $\|\theta_i^*(X_i)\| \geq r > \|\theta_0\|$ for all X_i. It is important to observe that $\theta_i^*(X_i)$ can not be a one-to-one function of $X_i \equiv (U_i, V_i)$. To see this, first observe that for any given constant c, the equation $\log f_i(X_i|\theta_0) - \log f_i(X_i|\theta) = c$, equivalently, the equation $\log f_i(U_i, V_i|\theta_0) - \log f_i(U_i, V_i|\theta) = c$, admits infinite number of solutions in (U_i, V_i), for any given $\theta = (\mu, \omega^2)$. Hence, for $\theta_i^*(X_i) = \varphi$ such that $\inf_{\{\theta:\|\theta\|\geq r\}} \left[\log \frac{f_i(X_i|\theta_0)}{f_i(X_i|\theta)}\right] = \log \frac{f_i(X_i|\theta_0)}{f_i(X_i|\varphi)} = c$, there

exist infinitely many values of (U_i, V_i) with the same infimum c for the same value φ, thereby proving that $\theta_i^*(X_i)$ is a many-to-one function of X_i. A consequence of this is non-degeneracy of the conditional distribution of X_i, given $\theta_i^*(X_i)$, which ensures that $E_{X_i|\theta_i^*(X_i),\theta_0}\left[\log\frac{f_i(X_i|\theta_0)}{f_i(X_i|\theta_i^*(X_i))}\right] = \mathcal{K}_i(\theta_0, \theta_i^*(X_i))$ is well-defined and strictly positive, since $\theta_i^*(X_i) \neq \theta_0$.

Given the above arguments, now note that,

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{\theta_0}\left[\log\frac{f_i(X_i|\theta_0)}{f_i(X_i|\theta_i^*(X_i))}\right] &= E_{\theta_i^*(X_i)|\theta_0} E_{X_i|\theta_i^*(X_i)=\varphi_i,\theta_0}\left[\log\frac{f_i(X_i|\theta_0)}{f_i(X_i|\theta_i^*(X_i)=\varphi_i)}\right] \\
&= E_{\theta_i^*(X_i)|\theta_0}\left[\mathcal{K}_i(\theta_0,\varphi_i)\right] \\
&\geq E_{\theta_i^*(X_i)|\theta_0}\left[\inf_{\varphi_i\in\Omega_r}\mathcal{K}_i(\theta_0,\varphi_i)\right] \\
&= E_{\theta_i^*(X_i)|\theta_0}\left[\mathcal{K}_i(\theta_0,\varphi_i^*)\right] \\
&= \mathcal{K}_i(\theta_0,\varphi_i^*), \qquad (3.20)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\varphi_i^* \in \Omega_r$ is where the infimum of $\mathcal{K}_i(\theta_0, \varphi_i)$ is achieved. Since φ_i^* is independent of X_i, the last step (3.20) follows. Hence,

$$E_{\theta_0}\mathcal{V}_i(r) \leq -\mathcal{K}_i(\theta_0,\varphi_i^*) \leq -\inf_{x\in\mathfrak{X},T\in\mathfrak{T},\theta\in\Omega_r}\mathcal{K}_{x,T}(\theta_0,\varphi) = -\mathcal{K}_{x^*,T^*}(\theta_0,\varphi^*), \qquad (3.21)$$

for some $x^* \in \mathfrak{X}$, $T^* \in \mathfrak{T}$ and $\varphi^* \in \Omega_r$. Since $\mathcal{K}_{x^*,T^*}(\theta_0,\varphi^*)$ is a well-defined Kullback-Leibler distance, it is strictly positive since $\varphi^* \neq \theta_0$. Hence, it follows from (3.21) and the fact that $\mathcal{K}_{x^*,T^*}(\theta_0,\varphi^*) > 0$, that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{n\to\infty}\bar{v}_n &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n E_{\theta_0}\mathcal{V}_i(r)}{n} \\
&\leq -\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{K}_i(\theta_0,\varphi_i^*)}{n} \\
&\leq -\mathcal{K}_{x^*,T^*}(\theta_0,\varphi^*) \\
&< 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, condition (4)(ii) holds.

Regularity condition (5) holds because for any $\theta \in \Omega$, $R_i(\theta)$ is an almost surely continuous function of X_i rendering it measurable for all $\theta \in \Omega$, and due to the fact that supremums of measurable functions are measurable.

In other words, in the non-iid set-up in the non-iid SDE framework, the following theorem holds:

Theorem 7 *Assume the non-iid SDE setup and conditions (H1′) (i) and (H2′) – (H6′). Then it holds that $\hat{\theta}_n \xrightarrow{P} \theta_0$.*

3.2 Asymptotic normality of MLE in the non-iid set-up

Let $\zeta_i(x,\theta) = \log f_i(x|\theta)$; also, let $\zeta_i'(x,\theta)$ be the $d \times 1$ vector with j-th component $\zeta_{i,j}'(x,\theta) = \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta_j}\zeta_i(x,\theta)$, and let $\zeta_i''(x,\theta)$ be the $d \times d$ matrix with (j,k)-th element $\zeta_{i,jk}''(x,\theta) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_j\partial\theta_k}\zeta_i(x,\theta)$.

For proving asymptotic normality in the non-iid framework, Hoadley (1971) assumed the following regularity conditions:

(1) Ω is an open subset of $\mathcal{R}^d$.

(2) $\hat{\theta}_n \xrightarrow{P} \theta_0$.

(3) $\zeta_i'(X_i,\theta)$ and $\zeta_i''(X_i,\theta)$ exist a.s. $[P_{\theta_0}]$.

(4) $\zeta_i''(X_i,\theta)$ is a continuous function of θ, uniformly in i, a.s. $[P_{\theta_0}]$, and is a measurable function of X_i.

(5) $E_\theta[\zeta_i'(X_i,\theta)] = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots$.

(6) $\mathcal{I}_i(\theta) = E_\theta\left[\zeta_i'(X_i,\theta)\zeta_i'(X_i,\theta)^T\right] = -E_\theta\left[\zeta_i''(X_i,\theta)\right]$, where for any vector y, y^T denotes the transpose of y.

(7) $\bar{\mathcal{I}}_n(\theta) \to \bar{\mathcal{I}}(\theta)$ as $n \to \infty$ and $\bar{\mathcal{I}}(\theta)$ is positive definite.

(8) $E_{\theta_0}\left|\zeta_{i,j}'(X_i,\theta_0)\right|^3 \le K_2$, for some $0 < K_2 < \infty$.

(9) There exist $\epsilon > 0$ and random variables $B_{i,jk}(X_i)$ such that

(i) $\sup\left\{\left|\zeta_{i,jk}''(X_i,\xi)\right| : \|\xi - \theta_0\| \le \epsilon\right\} \le B_{i,jk}(X_i)$.

(ii) $E_{\theta_0}\left|B_{i,jk}(X_i)\right|^{1+\delta} \le K_2$, for some $\delta > 0$.

Condition (8) can be weakened but is relatively easy to handle. Under the above regularity conditions, Hoadley (1971) prove that

$$\sqrt{n}\left(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0\right) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} N\left(\mathbf{0}, \bar{\mathcal{I}}^{-1}(\theta_0)\right). \tag{3.22}$$

3.2.1 Validation of asymptotic normality of MLE in the non-iid SDE set-up

Note that condition (1) requires the parameter space Ω to be an open subset. However, the proof of asymptotic normality presented in Hoadley (1971) continues to hold for compact Ω, since for any open cover of Ω we can extract a finite subcover, consisting of open sets.

Conditions (2), (3), (5), (6) are clearly valid in our case. Condition (4) can be verified in exactly the same way as condition (2) of Section 3.1 is verified; measurability of $\zeta_i''(X_i,\theta)$ follows due its continuity with respect to X_i. Condition (7) simply follows from (3.10) and condition (8) holds due to finiteness of the moments of the random variable $U(x,T)/\left\{1+\omega^2 V(x,T)\right\}$, for every $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, $T \in \mathfrak{T}$, and compactness of $\mathfrak{X}$ and $\mathfrak{T}$.

For conditions (9)(i) and (9)(ii) note that $\zeta_{i,jk}''(X_i,\theta)$ for $j,k = 1,2$ are given by $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\mu^2}\log f(X_i|\theta) = -I_i(\omega^2)$, $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\mu\partial\omega^2}\log f(X_i|\theta) = -\gamma_i(\theta)I_i(\omega^2)$, and $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\omega^2\partial\omega^2}\log f(X_i|\theta) = -\frac{1}{2}\left(2\gamma_i^2(\theta)I_i(\omega^2) - I_i^2(\omega^2)\right)$. Also since Delattre *et al.* (2013) establish

$$\sup_{\theta\in\Omega}|\gamma_i(\theta)| \le \left|\frac{U_i}{1+\omega_0^2 V_i}\right|\left(2 + \frac{\omega_0^2}{\underline{\omega}^2}\right) + \frac{|\bar{\mu}|}{\underline{\omega}^2}, \tag{3.23}$$

it follows from (3.23), the fact that $0 < I_i(\omega^2) < 1/\omega^2$, finiteness of moments of all orders of the previously mentioned derivatives for every $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, $T \in \mathfrak{T}$, and compactness of $\mathfrak{X}$ and $\mathfrak{T}$, that conditions (9)(i) and (9)(ii) hold.

In other words, in our non-iid SDE case we have the following theorem on asymptotic normality.

Theorem 8 *Assume the non-iid SDE setup and conditions (H1′) (i) and (H2′) – (H6′). Then (3.22) holds.*

4 Summary and conclusion

In SDE based random effects model framework, Delattre *et al.* (2013) considered the linearity assumption in the drift function given by $b(x,\phi_i) = \phi_i b(x)$, where ϕ_i are supposed to be Gaussian random variables with mean μ and variance ω^2, and obtained a closed form expression of the likelihood of the above parameters. Assuming the iid set-up, they proved convergence in probability and asymptotic

normality of the maximum likelihood estimator of the parameters. In this paper, we proved strong consistency, rather than weak consistency, and asymptotic normality of the maximum likelihood estimator under weaker assumptions in the iid set-up. Moreover, we extended the model of Delattre *et al.* (2013) to the independent, but non-identical set-up, proving weak consistency and asymptotic normality.

In Maitra and Bhattacharya (2015), we extended our classical asymptotic theory to the Bayesian framework, for both iid and non-iid situations. Specifically, we proved posterior consistency and asymptotic posterior normality, for both iid and non-iid set-ups. There we have also illustrated our theoretical development with several examples and simulation studies. It is to be noted that those examples, illustrating consistency and inconsistency of the associated Bayes estimators, remains valid in the classical paradigm with the Bayes estimators replaced by the maximum likelihood estimators.

Acknowledgments

Sincere gratitude goes to the reviewer whose suggestions have led to much improved presentation of our article. The first author gratefully acknowledges her CSIR Fellowship, Govt. of India.

Appendix

Proof of Theorem 5. We can decompose (3.2) as

$$\begin{aligned} U(x,T) &= \int_0^T \frac{b(X(s,x))}{\sigma^2(X(s,x))}\phi(x)b(X(s,x))ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^T \frac{b(X(s,x))}{\sigma^2(X(s,x))}(dX(s,x) - \phi(x)b(X(s,x))ds) \\ &= \phi(x)\int_0^T \frac{b^2(X(s,x))}{\sigma^2(X(s,x))}ds \qquad (4.1) \\ &\quad + \int_0^T \frac{b(X(s,x))}{\sigma(X(s,x))}dW(s) \qquad (4.2) \\ &= \phi(x)U^{(1)}(x,T) + U^{(2)}(x,T), \quad \text{(say)}, \qquad (4.3) \end{aligned}$$

where $W(s)$ is the standard Weiner process defined on $[0,T]$.

Given the process $X(\cdot,\cdot)$, continuity of (4.1) with respect to x and T can be seen as follows. Let

$T_1, T_2 \in \mathfrak{T}$; without loss of generality, let $T_2 > T_1$. Also, let $x_1, x_2 \in \mathfrak{X}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|U^{(1)}(x_1,T_1) - U^{(1)}(x_2,T_2)\right| \\
&= \left|\int_0^{T_1} \frac{b^2(X(s,x_1))}{\sigma^2(X(s,x_1))}ds - \int_0^{T_2} \frac{b^2(X(s,x_2))}{\sigma^2(X(s,x_2))}ds\right| \\
&= \left|\int_0^{T_1} \left[\frac{b^2(X(s,x_1))}{\sigma^2(X(s,x_1))} - \frac{b^2(X(s,x_2))}{\sigma^2(X(s,x_2))}\right] ds \right. \\
&\qquad \left. - \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \frac{b^2(X(s,x_2))}{\sigma^2(X(s,x_2))}ds\right| \\
&\leq \int_0^{T_1} \left|\frac{b^2(X(s,x_1))}{\sigma^2(X(s,x_1))} - \frac{b^2(X(s,x_2))}{\sigma^2(X(s,x_2))}\right| ds \\
&\qquad + \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \left|\frac{b^2(X(s,x_2))}{\sigma^2(X(s,x_2))}\right| ds \\
&\leq T_1 \sup_{s\in[0,T_1]} \left|\frac{b^2(X(s,x_1))}{\sigma^2(X(s,x_1))} - \frac{b^2(X(s,x_2))}{\sigma^2(X(s,x_2))}\right| \qquad (4.4) \\
&\qquad + |T_2 - T_1| \sup_{s\in[T_1,T_2],x\in\mathfrak{X}} \left|\frac{b^2(X(s,x))}{\sigma^2(X(s,x))}\right| \qquad (4.5) \\
&\leq T_{\max} \left|\frac{b^2(X(s^*,x_1))}{\sigma^2(X(s^*,x_1))} - \frac{b^2(X(s^*,x_2))}{\sigma^2(X(s^*,x_2))}\right| + C_2|T_2 - T_1|, \qquad (4.6)
\end{aligned}$$

where $T_{\max} = \sup\ \mathfrak{T}$; $s^* \in [0, T_1]$ is such that the supremum in (4.4) is attained. That there exists such s^* is clear due to continuity of the functions in s and compactness of the interval. In (4.6), C_2 is the upper bound for the function $\left|\frac{b^2(X(s,x))}{\sigma^2(X(s,x))}\right|$.

Since $X(\cdot, x)$ is continuous in x, due to continuity of $b(\cdot)$ and $\sigma(\cdot)$, for any $\epsilon > 0$, one can choose $\delta_1(\epsilon) > 0$ such that $|x_1 - x_2| < \delta_1(\epsilon)$ implies

$$\left|\frac{b^2(X(s^*,x_1))}{\sigma^2(X(s^*,x_1))} - \frac{b^2(X(s^*,x_2))}{\sigma^2(X(s^*,x_2))}\right| < \frac{\epsilon}{2T_{\max}},$$

so that the first term in (4.6) is less than $\epsilon/2$. Choosing $\delta_2(\epsilon) = \frac{\epsilon}{2C_2}$ yields that if $|T_2 - T_1| < \delta_2(\epsilon)$, then the second term in (4.6) is less than $\epsilon/2$. This shows continuity of $U^{(1)}(x,T)$ with respect to x and T for given $X(\cdot,\cdot)$. It follows that, for sequences $\{x_m\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$, $\{T_m\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ such that $x_m \to \tilde{x}$ and $T_m \to \tilde{T}$ as $m \to \infty$,

$$U^{(1)}(x_m, T_m) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} U^{(1)}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{T}). \qquad (4.7)$$

It is also clear that

$$\phi(x_m) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \phi(\tilde{x}). \qquad (4.8)$$

Now note that due to assumptions (H5′), (H6′) (observing that $U^{(1)}(x,T) = V(x,T)$ for all $x \in \mathfrak{X}$ and $T \in \mathfrak{T}$), and compactness of $\mathfrak{X}$ and $\mathfrak{T}$, we have, for any $k \geq 1$,

$$\sup_{m\geq 1} E\left[\phi(x_m)U^{(1)}(x_m,T_m)\right]^{2k} < \infty, \qquad (4.9)$$

for all $m \geq 1$, ensuring requisite uniform integrability. Hence, it follows that

$$E\left[\phi(x_m)U^{(1)}(x_m,T_m) - \phi(\tilde{x})U^{(1)}(\tilde{x},\tilde{T})\right]^2 \to 0. \qquad (4.10)$$

Let us now deal with $U^{(2)}(x,T)$ given by (4.2). Letting for any set A, $\delta_A(s) = 1$ if $s \in A$ and 0

otherwise, be the indicator function, we define

$$\begin{aligned}
Q(x_m, T_m) &= \int_0^{T_{\max}} \left[\frac{b(X(s,x_m))}{\sigma(X(s,x_m))} \delta_{[0,T_m]}(s) - \frac{b(X(s,\tilde{x}))}{\sigma(X(s,\tilde{x}))} \delta_{[0,\tilde{T}]}(s) \right]^2 ds \\
&= \int_0^{T_{\max}} \frac{b^2(X(s,x_m))}{\sigma^2(X(s,x_m))} \delta_{[0,T_m]}(s) ds + \int_0^{T_{\max}} \frac{b^2(X(s,\tilde{x}))}{\sigma^2(X(s,\tilde{x}))} \delta_{[0,\tilde{T}]}(s) ds \\
&\quad - 2 \int_0^{T_{\max}} \frac{b(X(s,x_m))}{\sigma(X(s,x_m))} \frac{b(X(s,\tilde{x}))}{\sigma(X(s,\tilde{x}))} \delta_{[0,\min\{T_m,\tilde{T}\}]}(s) ds \\
&= \int_0^{T_m} \frac{b^2(X(s,x_m))}{\sigma^2(X(s,x_m))} ds + \int_0^{\tilde{T}} \frac{b^2(X(s,\tilde{x}))}{\sigma^2(X(s,\tilde{x}))} ds \\
&\quad - 2 \int_0^{\min\{T_m,\tilde{T}\}} \frac{b(X(s,x_m))}{\sigma(X(s,x_m))} \frac{b(X(s,\tilde{x}))}{\sigma(X(s,\tilde{x}))} ds. \qquad (4.11)
\end{aligned}$$

It follows in the same way as in the proof of continuity of $U^{(1)}(\cdot,\cdot)$ that the first and the third integrals in (4.11) associated with the function $Q(\cdot,\cdot)$, are continuous at $(\tilde{x},\tilde{T})$. As a result, for given $X(\cdot,\cdot)$, $Q(x_m,T_m) \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$. It follows that $Q(x_m,T_m) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} 0$.

Now note that

$$Q(x_m,T_m) \leq 2 \left[\left(\int_0^{T_{\max}} \frac{b^2(X(s,x_m))}{\sigma^2(X(s,x_m))} ds \right)^2 + \left(\int_0^{T_{\max}} \frac{b^2(X(s,\tilde{x}))}{\sigma^2(X(s,\tilde{x}))} ds \right)^2 \right],$$

so that, for any $k \geq 2$,

$$E\left[Q(x_m,T_m)\right]^k \leq 2^{2k} E \left[\left(\int_0^{T_{\max}} \frac{b^2(X(s,x_m))}{\sigma^2(X(s,x_m))} ds \right)^{2k} + \left(\int_0^{T_{\max}} \frac{b^2(X(s,\tilde{x}))}{\sigma^2(X(s,\tilde{x}))} ds \right)^{2k} \right]. \qquad (4.12)$$

Since, by assumption (H6′) moments of all orders of $V(x,T)$ are finite, for any $x \in \mathfrak{X}$ and $T \in \mathfrak{T}$, and since $\mathfrak{X}$ and $\mathfrak{T}$ are compact, it follows that

$$\sup_{m \geq 1} E\left[Q(x_m,T_m)\right]^k < \infty,$$

guaranteeing uniform integrabiility. Hence,

$$E\left[Q(x_m,T_m)\right] \to 0, \quad \text{as } m \to \infty. \qquad (4.13)$$

By Itô isometry (see, for example, Øksendal (2003)) it then follows that

$$E\left[\int_0^{T_{\max}} \frac{b(X(s,x_m))}{\sigma(X(s,x_m))} \delta_{[0,T_m]}(s) dW(s) - \int_0^{T_{\max}} \frac{b(X(s,\tilde{x}))}{\sigma(X(s,\tilde{x}))} \delta_{[0,\tilde{T}]}(s) dW(s) \right]^2 \to 0. \qquad (4.14)$$

That is,

$$E\left[\int_0^{T_m} \frac{b(X(s,x_m))}{\sigma(X(s,x_m))} dW(s) - \int_0^{\tilde{T}} \frac{b(X(s,\tilde{x}))}{\sigma(X(s,\tilde{x}))} dW(s) \right]^2 \to 0. \qquad (4.15)$$

It follows that

$$U^{(2)}(x_m,T_m) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} U^{(2)}(\tilde{x},\tilde{T}). \qquad (4.16)$$

Using the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality (see, for example, Delattre *et al.* (2013)) we obtain

$$E\left[U^{(2)}(x_m,T_m)\right]^{2k} \leq C_k E \left[\int_0^{T_m} \frac{b^2(X(s,x_m))}{\sigma^2(X(s,x_m))} ds \right]^k. \qquad (4.17)$$

Again, due to assumption (H6′) and compactness of $\mathfrak{X}$ and $\mathfrak{T}$ it follows that $\sup_{m\geq 1} E\left[U^{(2)}(x_m,T_m)\right]^{2k} < \infty$, so that uniform integrability is assured. It follows that

$$E\left[U^{(2)}(x_m,T_m)-U^{(2)}(\tilde{x},\tilde{T})\right]^2 \to 0. \tag{4.18}$$

From (4.10) and (4.18) it follows, using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, that

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\left[U(x_m,T_m)-U(\tilde{x},\tilde{T})\right]^2 \\
&\leq E\left[\phi(x_m)U^{(1)}(x_m,T_m)-\phi(\tilde{x})U^{(1)}(\tilde{x},\tilde{T})\right]^2 + E\left[U^{(2)}(x_m,T_m)-U^{(2)}(\tilde{x},\tilde{T})\right]^2 \\
&\quad + 2\sqrt{E\left[\phi(x_m)U^{(1)}(x_m,T_m)-\phi(\tilde{x})U^{(1)}(\tilde{x},\tilde{T})\right]^2 E\left[U^{(2)}(x_m,T_m)-U^{(2)}(\tilde{x},\tilde{T})\right]^2} \\
&\to 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

Since $V(x,T)=U^{(1)}(x,T)$, due to (4.7) and assumption (H6′) (the latter ensuring uniform integrability), it easily follows that

$$E\left[V(x_m,T_m)-V(\tilde{x},\tilde{T})\right]^2 \to 0. \tag{4.20}$$

Let $G(x,T)=(U(x,T),V(x,T))$. Then it follows from (4.19) and (4.20), that

$$G(x_m,T_m) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} G(\tilde{x},\tilde{T}). \tag{4.21}$$

That is,

$$(U(x_m,T_m),V(x_m,T_m)) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \left(U(\tilde{x},\tilde{T}),V(\tilde{x},\tilde{T})\right). \tag{4.22}$$

Consider also a sequence $\{\theta_m\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ in Ω, converging to $\tilde{\theta}\in\Omega$. Then, for any function $h(u,v,\theta)$, which is continuous in u, v and θ, and such that the sequence $\{h(U(x_m,T_m),V(x_m,T_m),\theta_m)\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is uniformly integrable, we must have

$$E\left[h(U(x_m,T_m),V(x_m,T_m),\theta_m)\right] \to E\left[h(U(\tilde{x},\tilde{T}),V(\tilde{x},\tilde{T}),\tilde{\theta})\right], \tag{4.23}$$

ensuring continuity of $E\left[h(U(x,T),V(x,T),\theta)\right]$ with respect to x, T and θ. ■

References

Delattre, M., Genon-Catalot, V., and Samson, A. (2013). Maximum Likelihood Estimation for Stochastic Differential Equations with Random Effects. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, **40**, 322–343.

Hoadley, B. (1971). Asymptotic Properties of Maximum Likelihood Estimators for the Independent not Identically Distributed Case. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, **42**, 1977–1991.

Maitra, T. and Bhattacharya, S. (2015). On Bayesian Asymptotics in Stochastic Differential Equations with Random Effects. *Statistics and Probability Letters*, **103**, 148–159. Also available at "http://arxiv.org/abs/1407.3971".

Øksendal, B. (2003). *Stochastic Differential Equations*. Springer-Verlag, New York.

Schervish, M. J. (1995). *Theory of Statistics*. Springer-Verlag, New York.